

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and further examination are requested.

I. Amendments to the Claims

Claims 1-18 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein and replaced by new claims 19-22.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-5, 12-15 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Takano (U.S. 5,764,214) and Young (U.S. 5,877,762). Further, claims 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Takano, Young, and Hourvitz et al. (U.S. 5,388,201). These rejections are believed clearly inapplicable to new claims 19-22 for the following reasons.

Independent claim 19 recites an apparatus for controlling a screen resource that is required to display a screen on a display. Further, claim 19 recites that the apparatus includes an instruction section receiving an instruction to switch a screen currently displayed on the display to another screen. Finally, claim 19 recites that the apparatus includes a screen control section for, when it is determined that the currently displayed screen is hidden by the another screen, and when the currently displayed screen is in a resident state indicating that the currently displayed screen has a high frequency of display, displaying the another screen on the display without discarding the screen resource of the currently displayed screen.

As a result of the structure required by claim 19, the claimed apparatus will not need to regenerate a resident screen that has already been generated (i.e., “without discarding the screen resource of the currently displayed screen,” as recited in claim 19), which in turn makes it possible to improve screen display speed.

Young, Takano and Hourvitz, or any combination thereof, fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features and the result of the structure as recited in independent claim 19.

Rather, Young merely teaches generating a list of active windows (i.e., windows currently being displayed) and removing obscured windows from the list (see Fig. 2A, and col. 5, lines 54-65). More specifically, because Young teaches that all obscured windows are removed from the list of active windows, in order to display a resident window again, it is necessary to regenerate the resident windows.

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Young teaches that obscured windows are removed from the list, and teaches that a resident window that has been removed from the list must be regenerated in order for the resident window to be displayed again, but fails to disclose or suggest the screen control section for (when it is determined that the currently displayed screen is hidden by the another screen and when the currently displayed screen is in a resident state indicating that the currently displayed screen has a high frequency of display) displaying the another screen on the display without discarding the screen resource of the currently displayed screen, as required by claim 19.

In other words, because Young requires obscured windows to be removed and regenerated (if the removed window is to be displayed again), Young fails to disclose or suggest

displaying the another screen on the display without discarding the screen resource of the currently displayed screen, as required by claim 19.

Now turning to Takano, it is clear that Takano was relied upon in the above-mentioned rejections for teaching (i) a saving section, (ii) a display screen management unit, (iii) an instruction section, and (iv) a screen control section (see pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action of January 6, 2009). However, Takano was not relied upon for teaching limitations relating to determining that the currently displayed screen is hidden by another screen, and displaying the other screen on the display, as required by claim 19. Furthermore, after reviewing Takano, Applicants have found no portion of Takano that discloses or suggests displaying the another screen on the display without discarding the screen resource of the currently displayed screen, as required by claim 19.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that claim 19 and claims 20 and 21 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Young and Takano.

Additionally, Applicants note that in light of the discussion above, the combination of Young and Takano does not provide the above-mentioned benefits of the features recited by claim 19, because the combination of Young and Takano does not result in the benefit of the structure required by claim 19, such that the claimed apparatus will not need to regenerate a resident screen that has already been generated (i.e., “without discarding the screen resource of the currently displayed screen,” as recited in claim 19), which in turn makes it possible to improve screen display speed.

Regarding dependent claims 7-10, which were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Takano and Young in view of Hourvitz, it is respectfully submitted that Hourvitz does not disclose or suggest the above-discussed features of independent claim 19 which are lacking from the Takano and Young references. Therefore, no obvious combination of Takano and Young with Hourvitz would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the invention recited independent claim 19 and claims 20 and 21 that depend therefrom.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Takano, Young and/or Hourvitz or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Takano, Young and/or Hourvitz to obtain the invention of independent claim 19. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 19 and claims 20 and 21 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Amended independent claim 22 is directed to a method and recites features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 19. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 22 is allowable over any combination of Takano, Young and Hourvitz.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Ken YAMASHITA et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By: 2009.04.06 16:08:04 -04'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
April 6, 2009